

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

JAMIL ABDUL MUHAMMAD,

Plaintiff,

-v-

3:24-CV-1141 (AJB/ML)

SUFFOLK COUNTY SUPPORT *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**APPEARANCES:**

**OF COUNSEL:**

JAMIL ABDUL MUHAMMAD  
Plaintiff, Pro Se  
2030 Route 26 South, Apt. 209  
Vestal, NY 13850

**Hon. Anthony Brindisi, U.S. District Judge:**

**ORDER ON REPORT & RECOMMENDATION**

On September 19, 2024, *pro se* plaintiff Jamil Abdul Muhammad (“plaintiff”) filed this civil action alleging that defendants violated his constitutional rights in connection with his child support obligations. Dkt. No. 1. Along with his complaint, plaintiff also sought leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP Application”). Dkt. No. 2.

On January 28, 2025, U.S. Magistrate Judge Miroslav Lovric granted plaintiff’s IFP Application, conducted an initial review of plaintiff’s complaint, and advised by Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) that plaintiff’s complaint be dismissed without leave to amend. Dkt. No. 7. As Judge Lovric explained, plaintiff’s complaint alleged federal claims that were either not cognizable (*e.g.*, claims under federal criminal statutes), barred by limitations on federal-court jurisdiction (*e.g.*, § 1983 claims against State and Federal agencies), or failed to state

plausible claims for relief (*e.g.*, otherwise-cognizable federal claims against certain non-immune defendants). *See id.* Because plaintiff's federal claims were subject to dismissal, Judge Lovric further recommended that jurisdiction over any state-law claims be declined. *Id.*

Plaintiff has lodged objections. Dkt. No. 10. Broadly stated, plaintiff contends that Judge Lovric's analysis is mistaken and that a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction should have been issued in his favor. *See id.* Upon *de novo* review, Judge Lovric's R&R is accepted and will be adopted. 28 U.S.C. §636 (b)(1)(C).

As a final matter, the Court notes that plaintiff is a serial litigator who has filed fifteen civil actions in this judicial district in the last twelve months. With the notable exception of a single claim in a single one of these civil actions, all of plaintiff's cases have been *sua sponte* dismissed on initial review. Thus, as Judge Lovric stated in his R&R, plaintiff is warned that:

(1) proceeding IFP is a privilege that is extended to litigants at the discretion of the court; and (2) any further filing of patently frivolous lawsuits may result in the denial of any request to proceed IFP in an action and/or a recommendation to the Chief District Judge that a filing injunction be issued against Plaintiff, barring him from filing any future lawsuits in this district without prior permission.

Dkt. No. 10.

Therefore, it is


ORDERED that

1. The Report & Recommendation (Dkt. No. 7) is ACCEPTED; and
2. Plaintiff's Complaint is DISMISSED without prejudice but without leave to amend pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

The Clerk of the Court is directed to terminate the pending motion, enter a judgment accordingly, and close the file.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 25, 2025  
Utica, New York.

  
Anthony J. Brindisi  
U.S. District Judge